

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the February 4-5, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of February 4-5, 2002

**Commissioners
present
February 4-5, 2002**

Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
William D. Campbell
Irwin S. Field
Susan Hammer
Lance Izumi
Kyo "Paul" Jhin
Odessa P. Johnson
Robert L. Moore
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Olivia K. Singh
Melinda G. Wilson

**Commissioner
absent**
Howard Welinsky

Call to order Commission Chair Arkatov called the Monday February 4th 2002 meeting of the California Postsecondary Education to order at 1:30 p.m. at the California Chamber of Commerce, California Room, Esquire Plaza, 1215 K Street, 14th Floor, in Sacramento California.

Concent calendar Chair Arkatov asked for a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

A motion was made, it was seconded and approved to adopt the Consent Calendar for February as printed.

**Report of the
Statutory Advisory
Committee**

Report of the Statutory Advisory Committee, Todd Greenspan, Chair.

Mr. Greenspan reported on the January 29, 2002 meeting of the Statutory Advisory Committee, where some of items discussed at the meeting were as follows:

- ♦ New Guidelines for Campuses and Joint Facilities.
- ♦ AB 1570.
- ♦ Eligibility Study.

- ◆ The UC and CSU agreements for the joint Ed.D.
- ◆ The new cross-enrolment study.
- ◆ The Pew student engagement study.
- ◆ The AICCU Independent Articulation System.
- ◆ The governor's proposal for a new Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

**Speaker, Senator
Dede Alpert**

Senator Alpert discussed progress of the working groups in the Master Plan development process and indicated that the working groups are currently looking at the following objectives of the Master Plan:

- ◆ Creating a more cohesive educational system which would be pre-K through University.
- ◆ The Plan will be learning centered and student centered.
- ◆ How institutions can support student learning.
- ◆ Improving equity.
- ◆ Clarifying the roles, responsibilities and accountability for all.
- ◆ A long-term vision for education.

Senator Alpert reported that there are just under 300 people involved in the working groups. They were asked to think "outside the box," be provocative, and bring forward different recommendations and alternatives for the Legislative Committee to deal with, and to facilitate the development of a good Master Plan. She said the first two reports have been issued, which are the Governance and Professional Personnel Development reports. She indicated that hearings will be held to receive the working group reports, to allow people the opportunity to testify, and to provide the Committee the opportunity to present the recommendations and ideas developed to the legislators.

Senator Alpert estimated that a Draft Master Plan may be available in May, 2002.

The Master Plan Committee will facilitate the holding of hearings to present the Draft Master Plan across the State for the public and others to provide input. She said e-testimony and online dialogue via the internet will be part of the process.

She indicated that if the Master Plan is accepted by the Legislature this up coming summer, the next several years will be spent on follow up legislation, regulation and implementation that would begin to put the Master Plan into effect.

Senator Alpert noted that the following items emerged as cross cutting issues:

- ◆ Accountability.
- ◆ Alignment of K-12 and Postsecondary Education with a student focus.
- ◆ How to build and use data systems to enhance quality.

Senator Alpert informed the Commission that the Governance report suggests the following:

- ♦ At the State level, the governor should be the person to whom everyone in K – University reports.
- ♦ The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges should be strengthened with the responsibilities and authorities that are more similar to CSU and UC.
- ♦ There should be a reduction in the number of responsibilities related to the Postsecondary Education Commission.
- ♦ Sharpen focus to public interests.
- ♦ Re-assign the Commission’s data collection responsibilities to an independent third party.

Senator Alpert indicated that the working groups are considering the following matters:

- ♦ If the intermediate role played primarily by the County Offices of Education should be regionalized in the greater sense, or if it should remain with the 58 Counties but have an expanded role for the County Superintendents.
- ♦ Faculty infrastructure improvement.
- ♦ Expansion of professional development.
- ♦ Leadership development opportunities at the CSU, UC and California Community Colleges.
- ♦ Student Learning and how to define “high quality education” with a strong focus on equity.
- ♦ Finding better ways to support key transitions.
- ♦ School readiness.
- ♦ Workforce preparation.
- ♦ Emerging modes
- ♦ Financing
- ♦ Developing a local revenue option.

The working groups recommendation in relation to independent data collection evolved out of the following issues:

- ♦ At the K-12 level, there is very little usable data.
- ♦ At the higher education level, the Commission is in the position of asking for information that it does not always receive.

Senator Alpert noted that the Commission would retain program review and new campus approval, as well as the coordination, policy and fiscal advice functions, which will

retain part of the traditional Commission role, but would move the data collection activities to an independent group.

**Speaker,
Assemblywoman
Elaine Alquist**

Assemblywoman Alquist discussed higher education issues expected to come before the Legislature and her committee this upcoming season. Some of the items she discussed were as follows:

- ♦ Access.
- ♦ Accountability.
- ♦ Technology and tracking students.
- ♦ Community colleges as the backbone of the higher education system.
- ♦ K – University bond measure negotiations.
- ♦ Cal Grant program.
- ♦ Student fees.
- ♦ International education and student visa programs.
- ♦ Potential budget cuts of 12.2 billion dollars in the next budget year.

Chair Arkatov asked Assemblywoman Alquist to share her thoughts on the role of the Commission.

Assemblywoman Alquist indicated that she believes the Commission is the most respected commission on higher education, and that it has a proper role in trying to affect some of the changes in thinking that need to take place. She noted that the Latino/Latina and African American populations in particular, do not have acceptable graduation rates from high school or from college. She expressed hope that the Commission could do a study to find out why certain students are not being reached because every single student should have the same opportunity to move forward.

Because Senator Alpert had to return to the Capitol, Chair Arkatov asked Master Plan staff member Charles Ratliff to talk further with the Commission about its various recommendations.

Commissioner Schulze noted the Commission's concern with the proposed change in the data collection function of the Commission. Having been on the Governance Committee, Commissioner Schulze indicated that in her reading of the report, the data collection language is unclear and a bit harsh. She recalled that the concern the group had was that the data collection itself was the hardest part and it did not matter what entity was doing the data collection because the Commission and other entities were not getting the necessary cooperation. She recommended clarification in this area. She noted that if anything was said specifically regarding the Commission and its reports, it was that the organization and its reports were always outstanding.

Mr. Ratliff responded that the recollection of Commissioner Schulze was accurate. From the four working groups that have talked about an independent data collection agency,

all have voiced concern that there is not one centralized location where policy makers can turn to and gather information on educational outcomes in relation to the pre-K through university continuum. He added that there has been a consistent statement of support regarding the quality of data that is available from the Commission, but also an acknowledgment that indeed the Commission is beholden to the universities to respond, with no power of enforcement.

Mr. Ratliff said the other issue raised was whether to continue to have an artificial separation between Postsecondary Education data collection and another entity that deals with K through university, and yet a third entity that might be on personnel data needs.

He stated the question was whether or not the State should be looking at a single entity that serves as a central depository for all data necessary to make informed policy decisions.

He said the primary goals that came out of the Governance Committee as well as the other working groups, were the following:

- ♦ The quality of the data.
- ♦ Its longitudinal capacity.
- ♦ A centralized location with objective analysis.

Commissioner Schulze stated that having been on the committee she objected to the following statement:

“The fact that the Commission to date has been ineffective in the collection of data caused the group to view that entity as unfavorable in being the one to be given that charge.”

Commissioner Schulze indicated that there was no “fact,” and the statement is not true. She said she strongly opposed the sentence and would fight it. She said that there have been many statements made on paper by committee members that never came out of the working committees, yet there have been interpretations made from e-mails and phone conversations outside of the group process. She added that the sentence does not represent what many of the committee members felt, and indicated that the bottom line for the group was that there is nothing that mandates that data be sent to any entity.

Mr. Ratliff stated that after each of the working groups’ final reports are received, it is still going to be the Joint Committee that develops the priorities that will find their way into the Master Plan, which will be presented to the public in May. He said there will be ample opportunity to prevail upon the committee that a particular direction is not the way to go.

Regarding governance and data collection, Commissioner Rodriguez stated that much data exists now and yet the State fails to take action. He said there are a lot of issues that could be addressed today, and people are hiding behind the need to collect more information. Commissioner Rodriguez noted that there is movement and activity going on already, as there are two entities currently working on building significant data bases.

Mr. Ratliff said for purposes of the data base system, the best interest of the State needs to be defined clearly up front. He said much data are available but some of that information are none of the State's business. Mr. Ratliff did not anticipate that there will be encouragement of creating anything new, as there are many data systems that are very comprehensive in nature, which most likely have all of the data that the State would ask for. He said there will be concentration on how to link those data together in order to be able to answer the questions that are legitimately within the State's purview and interest. Mr. Ratliff explained that there must be appropriate leverages for each of the systems to provide data in some reasonable way on a routine basis.

Commissioner Chandler stated her concerns concerning duplication of effort and fiscal responsibility in creating another independent agency to do what the Commission can do. She said if the Commission has the leverage it could collect the appropriate data.

Mr. Ratliff said that, independent of what the individual working group reports say, the approach will be: If the State wants a centralized location for gathering data on the performance of education pre-K through University, then it needs to find that entity. He said it is not known whether or not the entity will be the Commission, some redefined entity like a California Education Commission, or the creation of a K-12 counterpart to the Commission. He stated that direction by the Joint Committee membership themselves on this issue is not to create new layers of bureaucracy and data base collection that will increase the cost of operation rather than attaining greater efficiencies.

Commissioner Moore stated that it makes sense to have the entity that reports on the data, be the entity that collects the data. He asked Mr. Ratliff if he has any reason to believe from his prior experience with the Commission that it would be inappropriate for it to be the data collecting entity.

Mr. Ratliff noted that he has a bias as he spent 12 years with the Commission and was heavily involved with data collection and long-range planning. He acknowledged that the Commission is an appropriate agency for the collection of data as it has demonstrated over the years to maintain objectivity and confidentiality of records. He said a factor in his thinking is how costs can be contained and/or avoided while still preserving and gathering the kind of data that the State would require. He felt there is logic to having the data collection and the data analysis housed in the same location as it reduces duplication of effort and it facilitates current definitions of data elements that are to be maintained and reported.

Commissioner Campbell noted that the statement implies that the whole group felt that the Commission was ineffective. He said if the Commission was adequately funded, had an adequate set of standards and requests, and then failed, it deserves to be punished. He added that when such a statement is in print, it gets a life of its own and if it is a misrepresentation of what the group felt, then it should be deleted.

Mr. Ratliff stated that the issue would be best addressed when the working group presents its final report to the Joint Committee. He said it is not in the purview of staff to change the working groups' reports.

Commissioner Hammer stated that if, in fact it is not an accurate statement and it is not supported by the majority of the working group, then it would be irresponsible to send it out in a draft report in May.

Commissioner Schulze suggested that the Commission as a whole requests the deletion of the statement in the form of a message to be given during the presentation of the final report.

Chair Arkatov asked Mr. Ratliff if he is in favor of the consolidation of agencies.

In response, Mr. Ratliff indicated that in his opinion he would favor the consolidation of several agencies under a Commission like the Commission, because he does not believe that there is an efficient or effective structure in place that currently covers both the public and private sectors.

Recess	Chair Arkatov recessed the California Postsecondary Education meeting at 3:02 p.m. in order to convene the Educational Policy and Programs Committee.
---------------	---

Reconvene	Chair Arkatov convened the California Postsecondary Education Commission at 4:35 p.m.
------------------	---

Speaker, Ted Lempert, CEO EdVoice	Ted Lempert, Chief Executive Officer of EdVoice, discussed his efforts and views with regard to ensuring passage of a California school facilities bond measure as well as potential legislation to improve data related to student achievement and school-wide accountability in K–12 public schools.
--	--

Mr. Lempert provided some background information on EdVoice and its organizational structure. He said the two primary issues EdVoice will be focusing on over the next year are the facilities bond and a state-wide data system. Four general issue areas of EdVoice focus are as follows:

- ◆ Recruiting and retaining great teachers.
- ◆ More funding and flexibility.
- ◆ The development of a stronger accountability system that makes sense.
- ◆ Choice in the public school system including charter schools and parental choice.

He said last year EdVoice focused on credentialing reform and a proposal to allow exceptional people to enter the K-12 classroom faster as a preliminarily credentialed teacher and on a facilities issue related to lease payments for charter schools in low-income areas.

With respect to the bond, EdVoice is proposing a higher amount than what is currently being discussed, which would be two \$13-billion bonds over the next four years. He said when the Conference Committee adjourned last year, it had a higher education figure of about \$4.6 billion and EdVoice is advocating a slight increase with \$100 million for community colleges.

Mr. Lempert said EdVoice is proposing a State-wide data collection system this year to assess how students and institutions are performing. This is necessary to develop a unique student identifier which would protect students' privacy while also allowing students to be tracked.

He noted that in comparison to all states, California ranks high in governmental programs, yet California does not rank that high in education. He said the decisions that are being made today do not match what the public is willing to do. Part of the reason for that is because the educational community has not put the pressure on aggressively.

He urged the Commissioners to compare governmental facilities such as federal, State, and city buildings with educational institutions. Mr. Lempert said Commissioners will find that the quality of educational facilities fall far below most other government facilities.

Mr. Lempert urged the Commissioners to take a look at the website EdVoice.net and sign up for the Alert system.

Director Fox noted that the two issues EdVoice is working on have been priorities of the Commission for years. He asked if Mr. Lempert if he would work with the Commission and read the language it has proposed with regard to the higher education bond and joint use proposals.

Mr. Lempert responded affirmatively and noted that EdVoice has not completed the higher education portion.

Commissioner Izumi asked Mr. Lempert for his opinion on how the unique student identifier might be received by the Legislature, because it is potentially a controversial issue.

Mr. Lempert said that once the privacy issues are addressed, his sense is that it will no longer be such a controversial issue.

Chair Arkatov suggested that the Commission work with EdVoice to set up an offer for a debate with the gubernatorial candidates in the fall on the subject of education.

Recess	Chair Arkatov adjourned the California Postsecondary Education meeting at 5:15 p.m. until the following morning.
---------------	--

Call to order	Chair Arkatov convened the Tuesday, February 5 California Postsecondary Education meeting at 8:37 a.m. He asked for a call of the roll.
----------------------	---

Call of the roll	Judy Harder called the roll and all Commissioners were present except Howard Welinsky. Commissioner Rodriguez arrived after the call of the roll.
-------------------------	---

Report of the Executive Director	Executive Director Fox thanked staff and Assistant Director Leveille for the support and accommodations made to keep the work going in his absence. He said it has been an
---	--

interesting and difficult time and he was pleased to be feeling better. He welcomed new Commissioners Field and Shetka.

Director Fox provided the Commission with an update on a K-16 case study sponsored with federal dollars through State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO). The following are areas that the study addressed:

- ◆ State-wide leadership structures.
- ◆ Curriculum development and assessment of learning.
- ◆ Outreach programs.
- ◆ Teacher quality.
- ◆ Data and accountability systems
- ◆ Student financial aid.

The California case study team included 20 individuals from around the country representing organizations like SHEEO. Director Fox said there was an outstanding discussion about leadership issues in education and structural issues in California.

Director Fox informed the Commission that a Joint Board on the Education Doctorate was put together by the University of California and the California State University to promote and solicit proposals for increasing numbers of programs for the joint Ed.D.

The board met and discussed progress and plans for the future and much of the discussion centered around the Commission study of supply and demand for the education doctorate. Director Fox stated that he met with President Atkinson individually to talk about the role and perceptions of the Commission regarding the doctorate and other issues. The Commission will continue to be informed about those conversations. He indicated that the printed word received at the Joint Board meeting said the Chancellor and the State University are excited to enter into such a program and look forward to success. He indicated that if the program proved to be unsuccessful, the State University would entertain the option of creating its own doctorate.

Director Fox reviewed discouraging news regarding current and proposed reductions in the Commission budget. Director Fox expressed hope to work with the Administration and the elected representatives in the Legislature to reduce the level of the proposed reductions in the Governors Budget.

Staff member Karl Engelbach stated that for the Commission to carry out all of its current statutory responsibilities, at a minimum, the Commission will need 60 civil service employees to do what it is currently being asked to do by the State. He said the Commission does not have sufficient resources in terms of personnel. He added that the Department of Finance is trying to direct exactly where the Commission is to take the cuts, as well as how the cuts are to be achieved. The Commission needs greater flexibility to be responsive to the needs of the Governor, the Legislature, the students, and the systems.

Chair Arkatov indicated that the Commission is requesting greater flexibility than the Department of Finance is currently willing to provide with respect to the cuts.

Referring to the public agenda, Director Fox noted that a new process of coordination in California was discussed at the retreat and workshop in San Diego. He indicated that the process would include looking at the State-wide data and making sure that the Commission could coordinate better as to what the State needs are regarding education and its delivery. He said the new philosophy is represented in the Public Agenda that has been compiled as a result of the workshop and retreat.

Commissioner Chandler indicated that the Commission needed the time in San Diego to develop a public agenda that is well defined. The three-pronged goal of the retreat was as follows:

- ♦ To better define the role of the Commission.
- ♦ To delineate the Public Agenda.
- ♦ To determine the priorities for future action by the Commission.

She said both in Los Angeles and San Diego, discussions regarding what is meant by a public agenda ensued. She noted that it would mean a shift in emphasis for the Commission from a focus on educational providers to a focus on the overall needs of the State, with particular emphasis on access and opportunity for all Californians -- from rational planning for State institutional models, to strategic planning for dynamic market models; from quality defined primarily in terms of resources as established within higher education, to quality defined in terms of outcomes, performances, and multiple stakeholders. She said multiple sources of funding were recognized, as were service areas defined by the needs of the clients and constituents.

Several priority areas that were focused upon are as follows:

- ♦ Growth and access.
- ♦ Preparation for postsecondary education.
- ♦ Baccalaureate production.
- ♦ Workforce preparation.

Director Fox noted that the highest recommendation by Jerry Hayward at the retreat is the following:

The Commission needs to pay attention to its policy, and the analysis of its policy recommendations needs to be strong as it possibly can.

Because of the proposed budget reductions and the hiring freeze, Director Fox indicated that he is unable to acquire new leadership in the policy area. As a result, Director Fox has reorganized the Commission by placing Dr. Leveille at the head of policy to give focused and clear attention to the policy issues the Commission must face and to the use of existing staff in policy and information systems in order to achieve success in the

priority areas. He said he is also moving other people and assignments around and he provided some examples of changes in staff positions.

Director Fox reviewed Tab 3 in the Agenda with the Commissioners. A brief description of each chapter/priority area follows:

1. Growth and Access: Accommodating California's Future Students.
2. Preparation for Postsecondary Education.
3. Baccalaureate Degree Production.
4. Workforce Preparation/Economic Development.

Director Fox made the following recommendations regarding where the Commission can make progress on the above priority areas based on current resources.

- ♦ Achieve moderate to high success in priority 1.
- ♦ Achieve low to moderate success in priority 2.
- ♦ Achieve moderate to high success in priority 3.
- ♦ Achieve low to medium success in priority 4.

Director Fox indicated that the Commission will only make low to moderate and medium success in priority areas two and four this year because the Commission will be dependent on another year for a study, and partnerships with others which will take time to build in order to use others resources and data for success.

In response to a question posed by Commissioner Hammer, Director Fox explained that approximately 75% of staff time is spent on statutorily required activities.

Concerning priority area four, Commissioner Johnson commented that she does not wish to see the Commission looking at the Ed.D. issue five years from now.

She also said there are areas in the State such as San Francisco, Long Beach and others, that have very fine vocational type programs in community colleges serving a large number of people. The impetus has not been there in a number of community colleges to expand their vocational offerings, particularly those that allow for easy access through the noncredit program. Community colleges are not interested in large numbers of noncredit programs generally because of the inequity in the funding mechanism. She recommended that the Commission focus on this problem and gain support from the Legislature because community colleges are really the savior and salvation for the workforce economic development needs of the State of California. She said this is an area of critical need that should not be put on the back burner.

Director Fox presented language capturing the February 4 discussion regarding the effectiveness of the Commission data collection to Commissioners. He indicated that with the changes, the document will be a statement to give to the Committee to have them remove the subject language from the record.

Commissioner Schulze stated that as a committee member, she will write to the individual Committee members requesting that the sentence be removed. Several Commissioners made suggested changes to the language. She moved to support the statement as amended and to have Director Fox read the statement to the committee in its meeting set for February 6. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Recess	Chair Arkatov recessed the meeting at 10:15 a.m. to take a five minute break.
---------------	---

Reconvene/Recess	Chair Arkatov reconvened the meeting at 10:33 a.m. and turned the gavel over to Vice Chair Moore of the Governmental Relations Committee.
-------------------------	---

Reconvene	Chair Arkatov reconvened the California Postsecondary Education at 12:15 p.m.
------------------	---

Report of the Educational Policy and Programs Committee	Commissioner Schulze stated that the Educational Policy and Programs Committee requests the Commission to adopt the report entitles “Needs Analysis for the West Hills College at Lemoore, West Hills Community College District”. She made a motion to adopt the report and it was seconded and approved by the Commission.
--	--

Report of the Governmental Relations Committee	Vice Chair Moore stated that the Governmental Relations Committee recommends that the Commission adopt the Legislative and Budget Priorities as set out in item 10 with a revision to the language on the student fee issue. A motion was made to adopt the report, it was seconded and approved.
---	---

Report of the Executive Committee	Chair Arkatov reported that the Executive Committee met on November 2 nd in executive session to discuss with the executive director personnel issues pertaining to staff and personnel decisions in light of the budget cuts. Guidance was provided to the executive director pertaining to the Commission’s planning priorities in a similar meeting November 3 rd . Feb 4 th the Executive Committee and its Committee on the Education Code Section 66905 met in executive session to review the performance and to set the salary of the Executive Director. Chair Arkatov noted that when the Commission brought on Jerry Hayward, it was not just to look at the director and staff, but that it was to look at the Commission in an effort to assure that everyone could be more effective.
--	--

Commissioner Rodriguez noted that during the meeting in executive session, the Commission felt that the Executive Director has done an excellent job under the most trying of circumstances and it gave Director Fox a vote of confidence and unanimous support.

Chair Arkatov informed the Commission that Commissioner Schulze has been asked to serve on the Executive Committee.

Adjournment	Having no further business he adjourned the meeting at 12:22 p.m.
--------------------	---
